

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Examiner's Advisory Action of November 23, 2009 issued in relation to the present Patent Application, the Applicant submits a Request for Continued Examination, Amendments to the claims and the below Remarks.

Claims 32 and 40-42 are presented for examination.

Regarding 35 USC 103 Rejections

Claims 32 and 40-42 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidman (US 5,080,364) in view of Silverbrook et al. (US 6,457,883) and further in view of Stangl (US 7,197,641).

Independent claim 32 has been amended to define the sensing device as being registered as being associated to the entrant. In order to identifying a telecommunication address of the entrant, this registered association between the entrant and the sensing device ID is used.

In Seidman the barcode scanners at the redemption locations 12 within the casino belong to the casino. There exists no correspondence between the barcode scanners and respective users. In Seidman, when token 32 is scanned, a message requesting entry of the patron's name, address and other identifying data is displayed.

Silverbrook is relied upon for teaching the inclusion of a sensing device ID in the data from the sensing device. Such a modification would essentially require each patron to bring their own barcode scanner with them to the casino, which would be contrary to any modification a person skilled in the art would envisage.

Stangl is relied upon for teaching utilization of a temporary communications address to enable communication to conceal an actual communication address. However, Seidman in view of Silverbrook fails to teach identifying any telecommunication address of the entrant from the sensing device ID, or receiving any message to be forwarded to the entrant's telecommunication address, whether directly or through the use of a temporary address. Seidman in view of Silverbrook does not teach any communication between the competition administrator and the entrant, or that any data with regards to the entrant is

communicated from the casino to the competition administrator. There is therefore no motivation to conceal the entrant's actual communications address from the competition administrator.

Claims 32 and 40-42 are allowable for at least the reasons presented above.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,



Kia Silverbrook, Managing Director

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: patentdept@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762